

**Report of Comments Received on CTP**  
*August 14- September 17, 2007*

**Section 1. Executive Summary**

Comment was received from approximately 75 people who have made comments on the draft CTP maps at the public meetings, in person, or by email. The Asheville Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force commented at one of their meetings, which had 12 members present, most of whom have not sent in other comments. The task force also provided results of a questionnaire from a series of public meetings they held in the Asheville area when the CTP process was first announced. About 90 people provided comment at those meetings.

There were many project-specific comments, though most (39) were in regard to widening US 25A/Sweeten Creek Road in Asheville (37 to 2 in favor). Other project-specific comments included one person noting that there is interest in a connector between US 276 South (Pigeon Road) and US 23 Business (South Main Street) in Haywood County, and another encouraging that the Balfour Connector in Henderson County be moved forward. Another person questioned the value of improving Route 191 in Henderson County, and its relationship to the Balfour Parkway proposal. There were several route-specific suggestions for bicycle transportation improvements, and one commenter who questioned the value of bicycle improvements in the presence of high levels of motor vehicle traffic. There were also two comments wondering why specific roads or sections were listed as needing improvement.

There were several comments that included concerns that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities be included in road projects. There were a few comments about transit needs, including one person who said that high speed transit or light rail should be included in the CTP. Transit providers from Buncombe and Henderson County met and provided comments on future transit routes.

We received some comments citing specific roads, streets or intersections as dangerous. While the comments are included here, they were also forwarded to appropriate municipal staff and to local NCDOT staff for their use.

One commenter questioned the classification of some roadways (i.e., boulevard, major/minor thoroughfare) and at least four questioned the designation of some or all "existing" on the bicycle maps for roads that lack paved shoulders or other bicycle facilities, citing concern that this designation would be equated with having adequate bicycling conditions.

One commenter suggested that medians were unnecessary for road projects and that two way left turn lane dividers were a less expensive choice, which would allow funds to remain for completion of other projects.

Many of the comments involved clarifications of or corrections to the maps, including road names, environmental and cultural features, and adding routes that bicyclists